

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

ALEX ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUMAN RESOURCES, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:22-cv-363-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Alex Adams, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.


On January 6, 2023, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss this case without prejudice for want of prosecution and Plaintiff's failure to comply with a Court order. Docket No. 11. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff. Plaintiff did not file any objections, but rather, filed an appeal with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Docket No. 13. On June 16, 2023, the Fifth Circuit dismissed the appeal, explaining that "[t]he report and recommendation of a magistrate judge is not a final order, and it does not fall into any of the other categories that would make it appealable." Docket No. 20.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 11) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for want of prosecution and Plaintiff’s failure to comply with an order of the Court.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **28th** day of **July, 2023**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE